

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
AFFEICATION NO. FIEING DATE		TIKST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNET BOCKET NO.	CONTINUATION NO.	
10/696,727	10/28/2003	Rush E. Simonson	080083.00004	6338	
20350	7590 06/13/20	05	EXAMINER		
TOWNSENI	O AND TOWNSE	ARAJ, MI	ARAJ, MICHAEL J		
	RCADERO CENTEI				
EIGHTH FLO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANC	ISCO, CA 94111-3	834	3732		

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•	Applic	cation No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/69	6,727	SIMONSON, RUSH E.				
O	ffice Action Summary	Exam	iner	Art Unit				
			el J. Araj	3732				
The Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this community	nication appears on	the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	dress			
THE MAILI - Extensions of after SIX (6) - If the period for a fixed pe	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD IN NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNITY of time may be available under the provision MONTHS from the mailing date of this common reply specified above is less than thirty (for reply is specified above, the maximum sely within the set or extended period for repleived by the Office later than three months t term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. Is of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In n Imunication. (30) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply all by will, by statute, cause the	to event, however, may a reply be statutory minimum of thirty (30) d nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a application to become ABANDON	timely filed lays will be considered timely m the mailing date of this co	r. ommunication.			
Status								
1) Resp	onsive to communication(s) fil	ed on						
	· ·	2b) This action	is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of	Claims		•					
4a) 0i 5)	f the above claim(s) is/a if the above claim(s)	are withdrawn from						
Application Pa	pers							
9)∏ The s	pecification is objected to by th	ne Examiner.						
10) The di	rawing(s) filed on is/are	: a) accepted or	b) objected to by the	Examiner.				
Applic	ant may not request that any obje	ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	cement drawing sheet(s) including ath or declaration is objected t	=		•	` '			
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	wledgment is made of a claim b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority	documents have be documents have be of the priority docu onal Bureau (PCT F	peen received. peen received in Applica Iments have been receiv Rule 17.2(a)).	ition No ved in this National S	Stage			
Attachment(s)								
	ferences Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summar		*			
3) 🔲 Information D	oftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date Patent Application (PTO-	·152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-10, drawn to an implant, classified in class 623, subclass 17.11.
- II. Claims 11-14, drawn to a method, ciassified in class 606, subclass 60.
- III. Claims 15-19, drawn to a method, classified in class 623, subclass 17.15.
- IV. Claim 20, drawn to a method, classified in class 623, subclass 17.16.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Where the two inventions are process and apparatus and the apparatus cannot be used to practice the process or any part thereof. They are independent (MPEP § 806.04. In the instant case the apparatus as claimed cannot be used to practice the method because the method required an apparatus with the lip of the inferior support being offset.

Inventions III and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used in a different process, e.g. in one where a whole disc is removed.

Inventions IV and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be

practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used in a different process, e.g. in one wherein only a portion of the disc is removed.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as usable together and they have different modes of operation e.g. invention II requires that a partial discectomy be performed and invention III does not.

Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as usable together and they have different modes of operation e.g. invention II requires that a partial discectomy be performed and invention IV does not.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed or usable together and they have different modes of operation e.g. invention III requires accessing the facing superior and inferior vertebrae and Invention IV does not.

Art Unit: 3732

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Groups II, III, and IV, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- I. Figure 2
- II. Figure 16
- III. Figure 22
- IV. Figure 35

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 6 appears to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

Art Unit: 3732

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Araj whose telephone number is 571-272-5963. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/696,727 Page 6

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJA MJA

> EDUARDO C. ROBERT PRIMARY EXAMINER